REMARKS

Claims 1-10 were pending in the present application. By virtue of this response, claims 2, 4 and 10 have been cancelled, claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 have been amended, and new claims 11 through 17 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5 through 9 and 11 through 17 are currently under consideration. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Tadatsu et al. (2900928).

With this Communication, claim 1 has been amended to recite a light emitting device including a semiconductor laser chip which emits a laser beam and "a reflective member formed of a fluorescent material which is excited by the laser beam to generate a light beam having a greater wavelength than the laser beam; and a protective plate for covering the semiconductor chip and the reflective member", wherein "the protective plate allows the light beam to pass therethrough and prevents the laser beam from passing therethrough."

Tadatsu discloses a diode having a light-emitting element and fluorescent dye which is "excited by a light from the [light emitting] element . . . at a wavelength to fluorescence at a difference wavelength from the exciting one." There are a number of elements of amended claim 1 that are not disclosed by Tadatsu.

First, claim 1 recites a semiconductor laser chip that emits a laser beam. Tadatsu, on the other hand, discloses a light-emitting diode which is not disclosed to be a laser device. Second, amended claim 1 recites a reflective member formed of a fluorescent material which is excited by the laser beam to generate a light beam having a greater wavelength than the laser beam. The fluorescent dye of Tadatsu is not disclosed to be a reflective member. Third, amended claim 1 recites a protective plate for covering the semiconductor ship that allows the light beam to pass

therethrough and prevents the laser beam from passing therethrough. Tadatsu discloses that a fluorescent dye or pigment surrounds the light-emitting element, but does not disclose that a laser beam is prevented from passing therethrough.

Accordingly, Tadatsu discloses none of a semiconductor laser chip which emits a laser beam; a reflective memberformed of a fluorescent material which is excited by the laser beam to generate a light beam having a greater wavelength than the laser beam; and a protective plate that allows the light beam to pass therethrough and prevents the laser beam from passing therethrough. Accordingly, it is believed that amended claim 1 is patentable over Tadatsu and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1. Thus, it is believed that claim 7 is also patentable over Tadatsu and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections under U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-6 and 8-10 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Tadatsu in view of Wilson (6,299,328).

With this communication, claims 2, 4 and 10 have been cancelled. Additionally, claims 3, 5, and 6-9 all depend from claim 1. Thus, as discussed above, each of these claim include elements not taught or suggested by Tadatsu.

Wilson discloses a structure for achieving a linear light source geometry including a linear light source (102 of Figure 3) surrounded by a reflective layer (106 of Figure 3). The reflective layer is disclosed as being "a diffuse reflector, a specular reflector, or a combination of specular and diffuse reflectors" (Wilson, col. 6, lines 1-4). However, nowhere does Wilson disclose a reflective member formed of a fluorescent material which is excited by a laser beam to generate a light beam having a greater wavelength than the laser beam as recited by amended claim 1. Neither does Wilson disclose a protective plate for covering a semiconductor chip and the reflective member and that allows a light beam to pass therethrough and prevents a laser beam from passing

therethrough, as also required by claim 1. Accordingly, neither Tadatsu nor Wilson disclose either of the elements. As such, neither Tadatsu nor Wilson nor any hypothetical combination of the two references can render claim 1, or any of claims 3, 5 and 6-9, unpatentable and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

With this communication, Applicant has added new claim 11 and 12 which are also dependent on claim 1. Thus, for the reasons discussed above, new claims 11 and 12 are believed patentable over Tadatsu, Wilson or any hypothetical combination of the two references.

Also with the communication, Applicant has added new claims 13-17. New claim 13 is independent and recites at least a light emitting device including a semiconductor laser chip with emits a laser beam and a "protective plate for covering the laser chip and [a] coherence reducing member; wherein the laser beam emitted from the laser chip is converted into a light beam by the coherence reducing member and the protective plate allows the lower coherence light beam to pass therethrough and prevent the laser beam from passing therethrough."

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, neither Tadatsu nor Wilson disclose a protective plate that allows a lower coherence light beam to pass therethrough and prevents a laser beam from passing therethrough. Accordingly, for reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, it is believed that new claim 13, and new claims 14-16 which depend from new claim 13, are patentable over Tadatsu, Wilson, or any hypothetical combination of the two references.

New claim 17 is also an independent claim. New claim 17 recites at least a light emitting device including a semiconductor laser chip which emits a laser beam and "a reflective member formed of a fluorescent material which is excited by the laser beam to generate a light beam having a greater wavelength than the laser beam . . . wherein the laser beam emitted from the laser chip is reflected by the reflective member and converted into the light beam having the greater wavelength."

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, neither Tadatsu nor Wilson disclose a reflective member formed of a fluorescent material wherein a laser beam emitted from the laser chip

is reflected by the reflective member and converted into a light beam having a greater wavelength. Accordingly, for reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, it is believed that new claim 17 is patentable over Tadatsu, Wilson, or any hypothetical combination of the two references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no.259052003400. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Douglas G. Hodder
Registration No.: 41,840
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-4203